

### Remarks

Upon entry of this response, claims 1-4, 6-7, 14-20 and 36-39 are pending. Claims 1, 2-4, 14, 15, and 16 have been amended. Claims 5, 8-13, and 21-35 are canceled. Claim 1 has been amended to correct typographical errors, including the correction of the misspelling of "1,2,3-triazolyl" (in two places). Support for "1,2,3-triazoyl" is found in the PCT publication WO 2005/085266 at least on page 9, line 20. Claims 2-4, 14, 15, and 16 have been amended to delete the redundant reference to claim 1. The claims have been amended to correct other minor typographical errors.

Claim 1 has been further amended to further recite the following values for M "(g)  $-NR^{114}-CH_2-$ , (h)  $-CH_2-NR^{114}-$ , (i)  $CH(NR^{114}R^{114})-$  (j)  $-NR^{114}-C(O)-$ , and (k)  $-C(O)NR^{114}-$ ". Support for the amendment is found in the PCT publication WO 2005/085266 at least on page 311, claim 13, lines 7-10. Applicant asserts that amended claim 1 remains novel and non-obvious over Or (cited in the previous action) –as amended, the claims still require a  $C_1-C_6$  alkyl group attached to an optionally substituted 1,2,3-triazolyl moiety (corresponding to D-E in formula I and II) and Or does **not** disclose compounds having this moiety. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to consider the amended values for M.

No new matter has been added.

### 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph

Claims 3, 4, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner states that claims 3 and 4 are in improper format because a multiple dependent claim should refer to the other in the alternative only –noting that claims 3 and 4 depend from claims 1 and 2.

As amended, claims 3 and 4 depend from claim 2. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that the claims are in proper format. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.


The Examiner alleges that claim 37 is incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. Claim 37 has been canceled. Accordingly, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection.

**Conclusion**

On the basis of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested. If there are any questions regarding these amendments and remarks, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Dated: December 22, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

For'   
By Ivor R. Elrifi, Ph.D. *Att. No. 57977*  
Registration No.: 39,529  
MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS GLOVSKY  
AND POPEO, P.C.  
One Financial Center  
Boston, Massachusetts 02111  
(617) 542-6000  
Attorney for Applicant